



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,811	12/12/2001	Robert J. Gaskins	ZK988/02014	8923
27868	7590	02/12/2004	EXAMINER	
JOHN F. SALAZAR MIDDLETON & REUTLINGER 2500 BROWN & WILLIAMSON TOWER LOUISVILLE, KY 40202			PAYNE, SHARON E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/020,811

Applicant(s)

GASKINS ET AL.

Examiner

Sharon E. Payne

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Prosecution on the merits of this application is reopened on claims 1-10 and 12-23, which are considered unpatentable for the reasons indicated below. The Examiner regrets the inconvenience that this action causes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 5 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mellema (U.S. Patent 4,551,793).

Regarding claim 1, Mellema discloses a road illumination luminaire for pole mounting. The luminaire includes a housing (Figs. 1 and 2), the housing having an illumination source (reference number 14) located therein (Figs. 1 and 2); a support arm integral with and affixed to the housing (Figs. 1 and 2), the support arm having a mounting plate for vertical surface mounting (cover member, reference number 13) and an integral davit arm aperture (reference number 35).

Concerning claim 5, Mellema discloses the mounting plate (reference number 13) that is located on a distal end of the support arm opposite the housing (Figs. 1 and 2).

Concerning claim 18, Mellema discloses a luminaire housing (Figs. 1 and 2), a lamp (reference number 14) within the luminaire housing (Figs. 1 and 2), a support mount affixed to the housing (reference number 35) and adapted to receive and securely affix a davit arm therein (Fig. 3); and a support plate on the support mount (reference number 13) mountable on a side of a vertical lighting support pole (Fig. 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 2-4, 7-10, 12-13, 15, 17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellema in view of Taylor (U.S. Patent 4,426,676).

Regarding claim 2, Mellema does not disclose a clamp bracket. Taylor discloses a clamp bracket in the support arm for securely affixing the support arm to a light pole inserted through the davit arm aperture (column 2, lines 46-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the clamp bracket of Taylor in the lamp of Mellema to clamp the apparatus to the light pole.

Concerning claim 3, Mellema does not disclose a leveling bracket. Taylor discloses a leveling bracket extending along an upper surface of the support arm and opposing the clamp bracket (Fig. 2) (The bottom portion with the screws is the leveling bracket, and the top portion with the ridges is the clamp bracket.)

Regarding claim 4, Mellema does not disclose a leveling bolt. Taylor discloses a leveling bolt (reference number 21) extending through the leveling bracket and threadably received into the support arm (Figs. 2 and 3).

Concerning claim 7, Mellema does not disclose a removably attached cover plate. Taylor discloses a removably attached cover plate (reference number 4, Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 8, Mellema does not disclose a clamp bracket. Taylor discloses a support arm with a curvilinear clamp bracket (Fig. 2, top) in the interior of the support arm, and further wherein the support arm has at least one clamp bolt (reference number 22) extending through the clamp bracket for securely affixing the clamp bracket to the support arm (Fig. 2), further the support arm having a leveling bracket (reference

number 14) extending longitudinally therethrough (Fig. 2), the leveling bracket further having a leveling bolt (reference number 21) extending through the leveling bracket (Fig. 2).

Concerning claim 9, Mellema does not disclose a leveling mechanism. Taylor discloses a leveling mechanism within the support arm (column 3, lines 1-18).

Regarding claim 10, Mellema discloses a light fixture housing (Figs. 1 and 2) and a support arm extending outward from the housing and integral therewith (Figs. 1 and 2), the support arm having a vertical mounting plate (reference number 13) the support arm further having a davit arm aperture formed in the vertical mounting plate (Fig. 2). Mellema does not disclose the clamp bracket. Taylor discloses the clamp bracket affixed to the support arm (Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 12, Mellema does not disclose a leveling bracket. Taylor discloses a leveling bracket extending longitudinally through the support arm (Fig. 2, column 3, lines 1-18).

Concerning claim 13, Mellema does not disclose a leveling bolt. Taylor discloses a leveling bracket receiving a leveling bolt (reference number 21), the leveling bolt threadably received into the support arm (Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 15, Mellema does not disclose a leveling mechanism. Taylor discloses a leveling mechanism in the support arm (column 3, lines 1-18), the leveling mechanism being designed to compress against a davit arm extending longitudinally into the support arm (Fig. 2).

Concerning claim 17, Mellema discloses a fixture housing (Fig. 1), a lamp (reference number 14) within the fixture housing (Figs. 1 and 2), and a lens (transparent hood, reference number 8) affixed to the housing (Figs. 1 and 2), means affixed to the housing for mounting the luminaire to a pole extending on a vertical axis (Fig. 2), and a second means affixed to the housing for mounting the luminaire to a pole extending along a horizontal axis (Fig. 1). Mellema does not disclose a leveling mechanism.

Taylor discloses a leveling mechanism within the luminaire (column 3, lines 1-18).

Regarding claim 19, Mellema does not disclose a clamp bracket or a leveling mechanism. Taylor discloses a support mount with a clamp bracket affixed to the support mount (column 2, lines 46-64) and a leveling mechanism (column 3, lines 1-18).

Concerning claim 20, Mellema does not disclose a leveling bracket. Taylor discloses a leveling bracket extending along a portion of the interior of the support mount (Fig. 2) and is adjustable therein (column 3, lines 1-18).

Regarding claim 21, Mellema does not disclose a leveling bracket. Taylor discloses a leveling bracket that is securely affixed at a first end to the support mount and is movable adjustable at a second opposite distal end (column 3, lines 1-18).

Concerning claim 22, Mellema does not disclose a leveling bracket or a leveling bolt. Taylor discloses a leveling bracket that has an aperture at the second end which receives a leveling bolt (column 3, lines 1-18), the leveling bolt threadably received within the support mount (Fig. 2).

7. Claims 6 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellema in view of Bilson et al. (U.S. Patent 4,152,757).

Regarding claim 6, Mellema does not disclose a mounting plate with a curved surface. Bilson et al. discloses a mounting plate with a curved surface (Fig. 1, reference number 26) and at least one bolt aperture extending therethrough (reference number 24). Mellema does not specifically disclose the mounting bolt.

Having the bolt aperture receive a mounting bolt is considered to be an obvious variation in design. Since the bolt is well known in the art, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the mounting bolt in the Mellema reference for attaching a light to a post.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the mounting plate of Bilson et al. in the apparatus of Mellema to mount the light to a pole.

Concerning claim 23, Mellema does not disclose a curved support plate. Bilson et al. discloses a curved support plate (reference number 26, Fig. 1).

8. Claims 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellema and Taylor as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Bilson et al.

Regarding claim 14, Mellema does not disclose a curved mounting plate. Bilson et al. discloses a vertical mounting plate formed at a distal end of the support art opposite the light fixture housing (Fig. 1), the vertical mounting plate having at least one

bolt receiving aperture (reference number 24) extending therethrough (Fig. 1) and having an outward curved face (Fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the mounting plate of Bilson et al. in the apparatus of Mellema to mount the light to a pole.

Concerning claim 16, Mellema does not disclose a curvilinear mounting face. Bilson et al. discloses a vertical mounting plate that has an outwardly facing curvilinear mounting face (Fig. 1).


Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharon E. Payne whose telephone number is (571) 272-2379. The examiner can normally be reached on regular business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

sep
January 27, 2004


Sandra O'Shea
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800